UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/068,816	02/05/2002	Felix G.T.I. Andrew	MSFT-1210(126608.2)	2569

7590 07/17/2008

Woodcock Washburn LLP
46th Floor
One Liberty Place
Philadelphia, PA 19103

EXAMINER	
STRANGE, AARON N	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2153	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/17/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/068,816	ANDREW ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	AARON STRANGE	2153	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *24 April 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *21-23,26-31 and 34-40* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *21-23,31 and 34-40* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 4/24/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

2. With regard to claim 21, and Applicant's assertion that Montulli fails to disclose that cookie information is exchanged between a host client and a slave client (remarks 8), it is noted that the rejection of claim 21 was based on the combination of Fin and Montulli and the that *combination* of Fin and Montulli collectively teaches this limitation.

Fin teaches a shared browsing system that intercepts requests made by a host client computer and provides the requests to client computers so they may independently make the same request (col. 7, ll. 21-31). Montulli teaches that client requests may include "cookies" that include state information.

The teachings of Fin and Montulli would have collectively taught interception of client requests containing cookies, and providing the intercepted requests along with the required cookie data to the slave clients to enable those clients to properly view the requested content.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 21-23, 26, 28, 30, 31, 34 and 37-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fin et al. (US 6,240,444) in view of Montulli (US 5,774,670) further in view of Grosser, Jr. et al. (US 6,473,798).

5. With regard to claim 21, Fin discloses a host client computer comprising:

a browser application (web browser 130)(col. 5, ll. 20-21) that issues a request for content on a server (web browser sends a request for a page through TCP/IP interface)(col. 7, ll. 17-21), the request comprising a locator (URL) corresponding to the content (col. 7, ll. 17-18);

a communications interface (TCP/IP interface 120) (col. 4, ll. 38-40; col. 7, ll. 19-21) to a communications network (network 115) for establishing a communications link between the host client computer and a slave client computer on the communications network (requests are sent via network 115 to slave computer)(col. 7, ll. 25-31); and

a shared view engine for receiving an identification of the slave client computer, intercepting the request issued by the browser (request is intercepted by CCI redirector)(col. 7, ll. 21-25), and providing, via the communications link to the slave client, a message comprising the locator (intercepted requests are sent to the slave client 150B via the network)(col. 7, ll. 25-31).

Fin fails to specifically disclose that the required cookie data is provided, along with the requests, to the slave client or that the communications link utilizes a tunneling protocol.

Montulli teaches a means of adding state information to HTTP, permitting web servers and clients to exchange state information for a variety of purposes (col. 7, ll. 45-54). Montulli teaches including cookies in client requests (col. 7, ll. 20-23) to exchange the state information and enable additional functionality. This would have been an advantageous addition to the system disclosed by Fin since it would have allowed state information such as user login information to be shared with the slave computers, permitting the slave computers to access the page when they did not have the appropriate cookie stored locally.

Grosser discloses that use of a tunneling protocol over a communication link to protect communications between devices on that link is well-known in the art (col. 1, ll. 33-56). This would have been an advantageous addition to the system disclosed by Fin and Montulli since it would have allowed the client devices to communicate in a protected manner, ensuring that unauthorized users would not be able to intercept the communications among the client devices.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a tunneling protocol to protect communcaitons between the clients and to include cookie information in the requests issued by the host computer, and provide the required cookie data to the slave clients along with the

intercepted request, since it would have allowed state information to be used for retrieving pages during a shared browsing session.

6. With regard to claim 22, Fin further discloses that the server is a Web server (Web server 110), the content is a Web page, and the locator is a Universal Resource Locator (URL) corresponding to the Web page (col. 7, ll. 17-21).

7. With regard to claim 23, Fin further discloses the host computer establishing a plurality of communications links to a plurality of slave client computers on the communications network (host computer may share pages with multiple receivers)(col. 5, ll. 59-63).

8. With regard to claim 26, Fin further discloses that the communications network is the Internet (col. 4, ll. 42-43).

9. With regard to claim 28, Fin further discloses that the communications network is a wide area network (the Internet)(col. 4, ll. 42-43).

10. Claims 30, 31, 34, 37 and 38 are rejected under the same rationale as claims 21-23, 26 and 28, since they recite substantially identical subject matter. Any differences between the claims do not result in patentably distinct claims and all of the limitations

are taught by the above cited art. In particular, Fin discloses that the client contains software for performing the claimed process (col. 4, l. 66 to col. 5, l. 7)

11. With regard to claim 39, Fin further discloses issuing by a browser application on the salve client computer a request for content from the server (any participant in the shared browsing session can request a new URL)(col. 13, l. 65 to col. 14, l. 5; col. 19, ll. 34-37).

12. Claim 40 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fin et al. (US 6,240,444) in view of Montulli (US 5,774,670) further in view of Grosser, Jr. et al. (US 6,473,798) further in view of Bladow et al. (US 6,115,040).

13. As discussed regarding claim 21, Fin, Montulli and Grosser substantially teach the claimed system. However, they fail to specifically teach that the cookie data is deleted from the slave client upon receipt of a termination signal that terminates the communication link.

Bladow teaches deleting cookie data upon receipt of a termination signal for a communication session. When a termination signal is received, the cookie associated with the current session is located and deleted (col. 17, ll. 42-49). This would have been an advantageous addition to the system disclosed by Fin, Montulli and Grosser since it would have ensured that cookie data supplied by the host client is not maintained on

slave client computers beyond the end of the shared browsing session, helping to protect the information contain in the host client's cookie files.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to delete the cookie data upon receipt of a termination session to protect the user of the host client by ensuring that the provided cookie data is removed from the slave client computers.

14. Claims 27, 29, 35 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fin et al. (US 6,240,444) in view of Montulli (US 5,774,670) further in view of Grosser, Jr. et al. (US 6,473,798) further in view of Renaud (US 6,021,491).

15. With regard to claims 27, 29, 35 and 36, while the system disclosed by Fin, Montulli and Grosser shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed above), it fails to disclose that the communications network is an intranet or a local area network. Fin fails to specify requirements for the communications network, stating only that it is a TCP/IP network and/or the Internet in some embodiments (col. 4, ll. 35-43).

Renaud teaches that web servers and clients may be connected using a variety of communications networks, including LANs and intranets (col. 5, ll. 30-38). It would have been advantageous to extend the system for use on LANs and intranets to permit users of those network types to share web pages.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to extend the system for use on LANs and intranets to permit web page sharing on those network types.

Conclusion

16. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to AARON STRANGE whose telephone number is (571)272-3959. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glen Burgess can be reached on 571-272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Glenton B. Burgess/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2153

/A. S./
Examiner, Art Unit 2153